

DeMaria, Eva

From: MCCLINCY Matt <MCCLINCY.Matt@deq.state.or.us>
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 1:07 PM
To: DeMaria, Eva
Subject: RE: Riverbank documentation

Hi Eva,

Dug out enough to pick this up. I am asking PMs to ID what we have electronically, what we have in hard copy and what is in archive. Most of the older documents will probably be in archive as we have little on-site storage in our new digs.

Because of staff resource limitations, we will defer pulling the archive files and contracting conversion of the hard copies to electronic files until after the first of the year. Just a heads up that DEQ will bill staff time, archive retrieval fees and contractor support to the LWG as work done in response to an EPA document request in support of the in-water work.

Also, please note that we will not be chasing down a copy of the 1997 Weston study which is listed as document a. under Hampton Lumber. The Weston study would have been the basis for the EPA scoring package to list Portland Harbor, and I am sure that EPA has a copy in their administrative record.

Matt

From: DeMaria, Eva [mailto:DeMaria.Eva@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, October 22, 2015 9:10 AM
To: MCCLINCY Matt
Subject: FW: Riverbank documentation

Matt-

I finally got our Superfund records staff to review what reports we actually do have in our records that document riverbank contamination. They identified a number of reports that we have (all the ones with a green number at the end, and those that say, "See above" (which just means it was a repeat cite)). Reports without a green number or "see above" means that we don't have them in our records. Most of the citations were found in DEQ's ECSI website. Would DEQ be able to send us electronic copies of these? Or, alternatively, if DEQ could identify only those reports (that we don't have) that document the riverbank contamination and send to us, that'd be great. Thanks.

Eva